

believed, will be constrained by the decided and constantly increasing force of public opinion, to give up their dangerous attempts to act on the institutions of other states. Those who may not be thus reclaimed or controlled, will be too few in number and influence, to be able to excite apprehensions.

Relying on the influence of a sound and enlightened public opinion to restrain and control the misconduct of the citizens of a free government, especially when directed, as it has been in this case, with unexampled energy and unanimity to the particular evils under consideration, and perceiving that its operations have been thus far salutary, I entertain the best hopes that this remedy, of itself, will entirely remove these evils, or render them comparatively harmless. But if these reasonable expectations should, unhappily, be disappointed; if, in the face of numerous and striking exhibitions of public reprobation, elicited from our constituents by a just fear of the fatal issues in which the uncurbed efforts of the abolitionists may ultimately end, any considerable portion of these misguided men shall persist in pushing them forward to disastrous consequences, then a question, new to our confederacy, will necessarily arise, and must be met.

Who but Governor Marcy, in future, stands at the head of mobs in the State of New York? He has full confidence in the "powerful energies of public opinion, as it has been called forth throughout the whole State." "Unexampled energy," &c. After all, the evidence that this "powerful" work of mobbing is producing the "salutary effects" of putting down the cause of abolition, or of preventing its constant accumulation of moral influence and power, he has not brought forward.—Where will he find it—in the recent speech of Gerrit Smith and letter of Wm. Jay, in his own State? In Mr. Garrison's faithful and fearless expose of the conduct of the mob, and the subsequent undisturbed session of the meeting which that mob had ruthlessly dispersed, in Boston? Does he find it in the *argumentum ad hominem* protest of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society? Where does he find it? We strongly suspect that he is now laboring to produce effect upon the people of the South. Be this as it may, he either deceives himself or them, or both. This declaration, together with a thousand facts that sustain it, is commended to the attention of all who pretend to flatter themselves or others that the anti-slavery cause is losing ground; for the sooner they do their worst, the sooner will the people be disabused, and know on what to depend.—Do what they will against this cause, they may as well go and build dikes of stubble against the tides of the Atlantic.—Let them no longer deceive themselves. They contend with Omnipotence.

The highest stretch towards despotism which we now observe in this very extraordinary message, is found in the call for the "sacrifice" of "opinions and motives." This is going one step beyond the demands of the southern people themselves, and is therefore supererogatory sycophancy. Even General Duff Green, and Governor McDuffie have never, that we have seen, demanded in so many words, that our "opinions" be "sacrificed." Indeed, we have not found in all the atrocious laws of the slave-holding States, that so much is required even of slaves. Is it not enough that a censorship of the press is undertaken, and that freedom of speech is assailed? Has it come to this, that, in the sixtieth year of the Independence—the LIBERTY—of these United States, the Governor of the State of New York wages war upon the right of opinion? What, in the name of martyr civil and religious—what, in the name of the holy prophets and apostles—what, in the name of Wm. Penn and Roger Williams—What are OPINIONS, that they should be, or can be SACRIFICED?

Let the people ponder this matter well. If Providence casts the lot of a temperance man in the neighborhood of drunkenness, and a "great majority" of them turn their "powerful energies" against him, in the shape of blows and brick bats, he must at once sacrifice the opinion that intemperance, which is the cause of this violence towards him, is wrong, and adopt the opinion that it is right! Protestants being among a great majority of Catholics, must sacrifice their opinions, and either be without opinions, or adopt the impious dogmas of the Pope! Apply the doctrine in the relation of one denomination of protestants to another—apply it in politics—apply it where you will, in any of the affairs of men—it is at war with every thing that is valuable and sacred in civil and religious liberty. It is the consummation of confusion—the acme of despotism.

The only apology we have to offer our readers for devoting so large a proportion of to-day's sheet to the subject of slavery is, the occasion. When there is less occasion, we shall say less. But while liber-

ty's noblest institutions are being torn down to make place for the towers of aristocracy—while human rights are ruthlessly trampled on with cloven feet—while the sacred palladium of religious, and all freedom is so furiously outraged, to withhold, or restrain our voice, feeble as it is, would be moral treason.

To the Editor of the Vermont Telegraph: DEAR SIR,—If you think the following worthy of a place in your most excellent paper, it is at your service:

"And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

"And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."—Matt. xvi. 18, 19.

This is the main, if not the only text bro't by the Roman Catholics, to prove the monstrous doctrine of the Pope's supremacy.—According to them, Peter was constituted both the foundation and supreme and absolute head of the church on earth; and the Bishop of Rome is his successor in office. If it should be admitted that Peter was clothed with all that dignity and authority which is contended for, there is no evidence that the Pope is his successor, or that Peter was Bishop of Rome, if he ever saw the place. But although some Protestants, and even Baptists, are willing to concede that Peter somehow or other is the rock on which the church is built, and that he had some peculiar prerogative above his brethren, to the writer of this, the sentiment appears to be unscriptural and unsafe.

1. The text does not require such a construction. Our Lord was pleased to ask the apostles the question, "Whom do men say that I the son of man am?" After receiving their answer, he put the question directly to them, "But whom say ye that I am?" Peter answered in behalf of the rest, as well as himself no doubt, as the question was put to them collectively. "Thou art Christ, the Son of the Living God." Jesus saith unto him, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my father which is in heaven." Christ was the subject about which the question was asked: his character was confessed in Peter's answer. This was the all-important truth which the Father alone had revealed to him, and which it is the greatest blessing to know. This is the fundamental doctrine which distinguishes the church of Christ from that of antichrist. It seems to me, that if Peter had been the rock mentioned in this passage, it would have read, "I say unto thee that thou art Peter; and upon thee will I build my church," &c.

But to come more directly to the point: That the rock mentioned in this passage is Christ, and not Peter, appears from the fact that Christ is the stone or rock on which the church is built. It would seem that it must be built partly on Christ, and partly on Peter; or wholly on Peter, or exclusively on Christ. But to the law and testimony: 2d Samuel, xiii. 32, "For who is God save the Lord; and who is a rock save our God?" Ps. xlviii. 22, "The stone which the builders refused is become the head of the corner." Isa. xxviii. 16, "Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation, that believeth on him shall not make haste." Our Lord quotes the passage from Ps. xlviii. as referring to himself. Matt. xxi. 42, "The stone which the builders refused, the same is become the head of the corner." Another of the inspired writers tells us, 1 Cor. iii. 11, "Other foundation hath no man laid, than that is laid, which is Christ." Eph. ii. 20, "And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." On this passage, let it be remarked, 1. That it may be understood that the apostle here reminds each believer, and the church generally, that they are built on the same foundation with apostles and prophets, viz: on Jesus Christ, the chief corner stone; and it is certainly true that apostles and prophets have no pre-eminence over their brethren in respect to their foundation. Or if it be understood that apostles and prophets in a secondary sense are the foundation, yet, 2. there is no pre-eminence given to Peter over his brethren; nor of apostles over prophets. Much the same may be said of the passage in Rev. xxi. 14, "And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb." There is no distinguishing honor given to one apostle over another. But why does our Lord so emphatically declare one of the apostles' names to be Peter, which is by interpretation a stone, and in connection with the building of his church? Answer: To denote that he was a precious material, to be placed in that building, and on that rock which he had brought to view in his confession, in connection with others. But how do you know this? Answer: By the fact that Christ is the rock on which his church rests; and that Peter is a member in that church—a stone laid upon that glorious foundation.—And surely we must admit that our Lord spake agreeable to fact.

Let us hear what this same apostle Peter saith on this subject. Acts ii. 14, "This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner." "To whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious; ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house," &c. "Wherefore also it is contained in the Scriptures, Behold I lay in Zion a chief corner stone, elect precious, and whosoever believeth on him, shall not be confounded." 1st Epistle of Peter, ii. 4, 5, 6. Thus it appears that Christ is the precious and sure foundation, and the saints the living stones of which the church, built on him, is composed; and as Peter was one of those materials, the church could be no more built on him than it could be said to be built upon itself. The safety of a building depends very much on the permanency of its foundation; and so our Lord teaches us in the passage under examination; but alas! what would have become of the church if it had rested for safety on poor Peter?

There is another point in this subject, (if it may be considered another.) As keys are a symbol of authority and power, the Pope, Peter's pretended successor in office, has claimed for Peter, and for himself from Peter a supremacy not only over the Church generally, but over the other apostles; nay over kings and emperors, in things temporal, spiritual and

eternal. It is admitted that the twelve apostles held a place in the gospel church which no other persons ever held; but it is denied that Peter held a supremacy over the other apostles, or over the church, any more than the other apostles. Had this been the case, it is reasonable to suppose that our Lord would have given him an explicit commission, defining his powers, and commanding others to be subject to his authority, &c. But we find no such commission, but much to the contrary. Matt. xix. 28, "Jesus saith to the twelve, when the son of man shall sit upon the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Here we see no distinguishing authority or honor conferred upon Peter, or any one of them, but all are placed on a level. Foreseeing that such lordly pretensions would be made, if not by Peter, yet by his pretended successor, in after times, to check the very first rising of an aspiring disposition among his followers, Jesus called them unto him and said, "ye know that the princess of the gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them; but it shall not be so among you, Matt. xx: He forbids his disciples, either to call others master, or be called so themselves. Surely this does not look like crowning Peter with sovereign authority over the church of God, or giving him the primacy over his brethren in any sense.

2. As Christ gave no such commission to Peter, so neither the other apostles acknowledge any such. Paul says, 2 Cor. xii. 14, "In nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles, though I be nothing." This was not paying a very high compliment to Peter more than himself. In another instance he withstood Peter to the face; for he said he was to be blamed.—Gal. ii. 11. If Peter had claimed the same power and infallibility as the Roman Pontiff, it is doubtful whether Paul would not have had to do penance for this; but we learn nothing but that Peter bore it very patiently. And not only the apostle Paul, but the apostles and brethren that were of the circumcision, contended with him, saying, Thou watest in to men uncircumcised, and did eat with them.—Acts xi. This was far from an acknowledgement of Peter's infallibility or superiority in any way.

3. Neither does Peter claim any such superiority. In his two general Epistles he styles himself an apostle of Jesus Christ. "The elders which are among you," saith he, "I exhort, who also am an elder." He claims no preeminence over other elders, while he exhorts them, among other important matters, not to lord it over God's heritage, but, to be examples to the flock. And though he was an eye witness of the majesty of Christ, he cites them to a more sure word of prophecy, viz. the scriptures. How different this from the style and character of a haughty wretch who blasphemously claims to be the successor of St. Peter. Christ's vicegerent and God upon earth. Now, although those protestants with whom I differ do not raise Peter so high above his brethren as the Roman Pontiff, yet it appears to me they place him where he is neither placed by Christ, by the other apostles, nor by himself. And notwithstanding there is no sense in the Pope's claim to be Peter's successor in office, any more than the Bishop of London, yet by his construction of this passage, the minds of many uninformed protestants have been entangled. If the above shall have the effect to establish any minds in the truth it amply compensates

REMARKS.

The remarks of "A Protestant" were probably elicited by an article which appeared in No. 7 of the present volume of the Telegraph, on expository preaching, which article contained a brief extract of a discourse upon the passage of Scripture which heads the foregoing. It will be recollected that the views of the former expositor were endorsed by us, at the time of giving them publicity. We had what we called our reasons for so doing, and to us, they appear valid yet—withstanding our great personal regard for "A Protestant," and the perfect concordance of views existing between him and ourselves, in most of the material points in morals and religion.

That our brother (or rather father in Israel) should feel unwilling to have a construction put upon any passage of Scripture that would favor Romanism, is no matter of wonder; for nothing can be more abhorrent to a Protestant—nothing is in itself more ridiculous, absurd and impious, than the pretensions of these wicked men to infallibility and divine supremacy. But nothing is lost, in discussion, by allowing a fair and obvious construction of language, according to the first and plain laws of interpretation. "A Protestant" very justly remarks that, "If it should be admitted that Peter was clothed with all the dignity and authority that is contended for, there is no evidence that the Pope is his successor; or that Peter was Bishop of Rome, if he ever saw the place." This is most true. Wherein, then, is it "unsafe" to "concede that Peter is the rock?" The apostles are a part of the foundation on which the church is built.—See Eph. ii. 20. We know of no Protestant who claims for Peter any "supremacy over the other apostles." Yet none, it is presumed, will deny to him distinctive characteristics, and distinguished trusts. He was one of the "sons of thunder." Christ gave to him personally, and singly, the "keys of the kingdom of heaven." To him the sheet was let down, conveying to him the first commission to the Gentiles. Notwithstanding he once gave way to tem-

perament, he was characterized by native boldness and firmness: When the Savior put the question to the disciples collectively, "Whom say ye that I am?" Peter was the first to answer. After our Lord's resurrection and ascension, which finished his faith by giving him a more perfect understanding of the great salvation, earth and hell combined could not move him. His firmness led him to suffer crucifixion.

Let us now examine the passage. And here we first invite attention to the fact that the disciple we have been speaking of, on the occasion described in the passage, received a new name. He had before been called Simon; he now received the name of Peter—rock. If he was an unfit material for a part of the foundation to build the church upon, why did Christ attach to him the name of the very article most fit to be used in laying a foundation? And what is plainer from the whole passage and the context, than that this appellation was chosen by way of attaching eminence to the individual? What is important in the case is, in the original there is no article before the word *Petros*, in the sentence, "thou art Peter; and upon this rock," &c. Our translation might have read, "thou art rock; and on this rock I will build my church," &c.

It is not contended that Peter alone comprised all the foundation—that the church rests solely on "poor Peter." It is granted that, according to the passage already quoted from Ephesians, the other apostles were each component parts—Peter being eminent among them, and Christ being "the chief corner." This view of the subject does not render it necessary to suppose that Christ gave Peter the precedence to himself in laying the foundation of his church. Suppose the Savior had come down to the earth again at the time Luther was raised up, with a view to lay a plan for the Reformation. Suppose that after he had selected Luther, Melancthon and others to take the lead, he had addressed Luther thus:—"Thou art a son of thunder. Thou art firm and stable. On thy shoulders shall rest this great reformation." Would this bestowing the called a precedence to him who had called him? Certainly not. Nor would it exclude the idea of Luther's having yoke-fellows to assist him in carrying the burden.

"A Protestant" admits that Peter was a stone—a "precious material;" but he wants to have him with the other apostles "placed in" the "building," and "upon" the "foundation." This involves the idea of a foundation upon a foundation, if there be truth in Paul, in the passage already cited from his epistle to the Ephesians. Grant this to be correct, still we have Paul's testimony further, in the same passage, that the church is built upon this foundation, which, according to the doctrine of "A Protestant," rests upon another foundation. It is true, that Christ is the chief corner. It is at the same time true, that the apostles, with the prophets, are the foundation. It is also true, that Peter was eminent among the apostles, components of this foundation. We do not, then, discover the necessity of putting a construction upon the passage which heads "A Protestant's" article, that sets aside the first laws of interpretation.

A call for a State Anti-Slavery Convention in Rhode-Island, to meet in Providence, on the 2d of February, is signed by 850 names, from all the towns in the State excepting two. Let the people of the South not deceive themselves by giving credence to the false representations of Gov. Mircy and others who would have them believe that anti-slavery is on the wane in the North. At no time were converts multiplying faster than at this moment. Let aristocrats tremble. They have had their day. The people are arousing. Violence is subsiding. Tyranny is already pale-faced. Henceforth, the contest will be a war of opinion. The struggle will be short. The victory will be peaceful and glorious. Right will displace wrong—intelligence, ignorance—humanity, cruelty—order, confusion—law, anarchy—benevolence, selfishness—reason, madness and folly—equity, extortion—peace, violence—religion, heathenism and atheism.

POSTAGE. Our friends are informed that the postmaster here, challenges our letters, as the law requires, when he suspects they contain money, if double postage has not been paid. This in many instances makes a draft of a large percentage from the amount received. In one instance it was 12 1-2 cents from a dollar, leaving 87 1-2 cents. It is hoped that such cases will not occur often. But suppose it to be only ten cents from every subscription of two dollars, and that the number is 1500. The loss is one hundred and fifty dollars. The loss, it is true, has not yet been at this rate; but we candidly put the question: Do our friends think we ought to be constantly sustaining loss on this score? Our friends will bear with our plainness on these points; for they will at once see it to be a duty owed to ourselves, and to the paper if it is to be sustained.

AGENTS.—A subscriber sends us \$1.50 for a single subscription, in the town of Northfield, stating that it is in fulfillment of agreement with our agent. We have not authorized any agent to make any such bargains—they are of course null & void. We authorize no agents to vary from our published terms.

Books.—We have received diverse books from Messrs. Gould, Kendall and Lincoln, Boston, and others. Extracts and remarks next week.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—Brother Nathaniel Colver's communication—"Thou's on Family Worship"—"Vindex"—and others, are on file for insertion. As many of them as possible shall appear in our next.

"Auditor," a part of whose communication appears to-day, is informed that it was purely a mistake of our compositor, in not turning over the leaf of the manuscript, that a part of his article is omitted. The page was made up before the omission was detected. The part left out was a statement of the interesting fact that, *rum* was no helper in the performance of any part of the work.

The Mexicans shot 23 prisoners, at Tampico, on the morning of the 14th ult. Among the number, was Jonas K. Stuart of Vermont, aged 33 years.

LIBERAL.—A subscription was lately opened in Montreal, for the purpose of raising \$2,000, towards the relief of the sufferers in New-York. It was filled in a few minutes.

Greene C. Bronson, Attorney General, has been appointed successor of Judge Southerland, on the bench of the Supreme Court.

CONGRESSIONAL.

At the latest dates received from Washington, the "agitating" subject of slavery in the District of Columbia was kept before both houses of Congress. Petitions were pouring in from different parts of the free states. The question concerning slavery had very much given place to the novel question, as to the right of petitioning Congress for the exercise of its constitutional powers for the removal of slavery from the doors of our National Capitol.—It was not enough for southern men to question this most constitutional and sacred right of the people of this nation—but a Mr Jarvis from Maine had the baseness to offer a resolution for the non-entertainment of such petitions. Southern members are exceedingly irritable, and more than almost any other, a Mr Wise, another John Randolph, from Virginia.—Those who have exhibited the most fidelity to the cause of liberty and humanity, are among the delegation from Massachusetts, Rhode-Island and Vermont. No business of any consequence has yet come to a point.

From the N. Y. Spectator.

THURSDAY MORNING, Jan. 14th.

Our latest advices from the capital brought the proceedings in Congress on Thursday. We have now the proceedings of Monday and Tuesday.

On Monday, in the Senate, a petition to abolish slavery in the District was presented, and, on motion of Mr Clay, laid on the table.

Mr Clay offered a resolution that the President be requested to inform the Senate whether any overture, formal or informal, official or unofficial, has been made by the French government; and particularly whether a despatch from the duke de Broglie to the French Charge at Washington had been received and a copy furnished to the Secretary of State. Also what answer was given thereto—and if such despatch was received, to communicate a copy to the Senate. The resolution lay one day on the table.

Mr Benton offered a resolution that the surplus monies be applied to the defence of the country—this resolution also lay one day on the table.

In the house, Mr Cambreleng gave notice that he should call up the appropriation bills on the next day for the army and navy.

Mr Jarvis, chairman of the naval committee, moved that the committee be instructed to inquire into the expediency of increasing the naval force. After considerable debate the motion was carried 164 to 18.

On Tuesday, in the senate, on motion of Mr Webster, the bill for granting relief to the sufferers by the fire was taken up, and after some discussion laid on the table until Wednesday.

Mr Clay's resolution requesting information on the subject of French relations was amended, on Motion of Mr Leigh, so as to request also a copy of Mr Serrurier's note of 25th February, mentioned in the president's message—and then adopted.

Mr Benton's resolution to appropriate the surplus monies for defence, was taken up and discussed, but the Senate adjourned without coming to any decision thereon.

LOWELL (MASS.) MANUFACTURES.—In 1820 the whole population of Lowell was only 203—at the present time the population is computed at upwards of 16,000.—The first effort to promote manufactures in Lowell was done; however, until 1820, when Messrs. Patrick T. Jackson, Nathan Appleton, and Kirk Boot of Boston, entered into a design to form a Company for the purpose of manufacturing cotton goods. At the present time, the following is the state of the Manufactures in Lowell: Capital Stock invested 7,650,000 Number of Mills erected 27 Spindles in operation 129,828 Looms 4,197 Females employed 5,416 Males 1,477 Yards of cloth made per week 849,300 Yards of cloth made per an. 44,168,600 Lbs. of cotton wrought per an. 13,676,600 Bales of cotton used per week 732 Yards of cotton dyed and printed per week 283,000 Tons of Anthracite Coal expended per annum 9,453 Bushels of Charcoal 500,000 Cords of Wood per annum 4,690 Gallons of Oil 54,824 Average wages of females clear of board \$2 Average amount of wages paid per month \$106,000 Consumption of Starch per an. 510,000

In addition to the above named manufactures, may be mentioned, the extensive Powder Mills of Oliver M. Whipple; the Lowell Bleachery; Flannel Mills; Card and Whip Factory; Planing Machine; Reed Machine; Grist and Saw mills—together employing about 300 hands, and a capital of \$300,000. And in the immediate vicinity, Glass Works, and a Furnace supplying every description of castings. Also, a Worsted Mill, formerly the Hurd Woolen Mill, under the direction of Mr M. H. Simpson, operates 1200 spindles, employs 125 persons, consumes 1,000,000 lbs. of wool, and 11,250 gallons of oil, per annum.

The Locks and Canals, Machine Shop, included among the 27 Mills, can furnish machinery complete for a mill of 5,000 spindles, in four months, and lumber and materials are always at command, with which to build or rebuild a mill in that time, if required.—Mer. Jour.

BRANDON LYCEUM.

QUESTION FOR DISCUSSION, THIS (THURSDAY) EVENING.

Are affluent circumstances more favorable to genius, than depressed circumstances?

Meeting at the school-house, North of the Baptist Meeting-House.

By order, D. S. MURRAY, Sec. pro tem.

WEEKLY RECEIPTS.

Samuel Aiken	\$2.00	John Blanchard	1.50
Frederick Scofield	1.25	Samuel Burton	1.50
Bradley Soule	10.00	Simone Richmond	1.50
Rev. Dan'l Bennett	2.00	Rev. E. Hurlvort	1.50
C. Hoven	2.00	Sam'l Pettigill	1.50
Ziba Howard	2.00	Rev. Nath'l Colver	2.00
John Bulard	2.00	Daniel Church	1.50
Timothy Grow	2.00	Rev. B. Carpenter	11.57
Simone Alvord	2.00	Sturley Westcott	2.00
Caleb Hendrick	2.00	Joseph Manning	1.50
Wm. Short	2.00	Rev. D. Boynton	1.50
Thomas Lawton	2.00	Daniel Dodge	1.50
George Lawton	2.00	Geo W. Perkins	1.50
Diana Chamberlain	2.00	Nathan Slocumb	1.50
David Grow	2.00	Hiram Earl	1.50
Rev. Sem Pierce	1.50	Nathan Perkins	.90
Calvin Mead	1.50	ten cents off for postage	
J. & S. Pierce	1.50	Jehad Ford	1.00
Parker Stevens	1.00	Jona. B. Spencer	1.50
David Richardson	1.50	Sam'l Shepherd	1.50
Rev. Wm. Walker	2.00	John G. Smith	1.50
Asa H. Whipple	2.00	Dea. Wm. Arnold	1.00
Dea Sam'l Manning	1.50	E. C. Culver	1.00
John Pettengill	1.50	John Chandler	1.50

MARRIED.

In Londonderry, January 8d, by Rev. Sam. Pierce, Mr. Geo. Snow of Walpole, N. H. to Miss Olivia Warner of the former place.

On the 4th, of Joseph Gale, to Miss Achash French, both of Jamaica. On the 10th, Mr. John Garfield Jr. to Miss Charlotte Cheney, both of Londonderry. In Peru, on the 10th, Mr. Alva Brooks of Halifax, to Miss Levis Hapgood.—Also at the same time and place, Mr. Wm. W. Whitney to Miss Pines Hapgood, both of Peru. In Hartland, Mr. James More of Crownpoint, N. Y. to Miss Louisa Fuller of the former place.

DIED.

In this village, on Wednesday 13th inst. SARAH SOPHIA, daughter of Matthew W. Birchard Esq. aged 18 years.

In Hubbardston, 5th inst. of pulmonary consumption, Mary Herrick, aged 21 years. The N. Y. Baptist Register is requested to notice &c.

CORRECTION.—In our list of deaths, last week, "Thays" should have been "Shays."

SHEEP'S BELTS.

CASH, and the highest price will be paid for pelts, by E. R. MASON & Co. Leicester, Oct. 5, 1835. 2-6m.

LOST.

IN the street, between Conant's Store and Frost's Tavern, in Brandon, on the evening of the 21st Nov., or taken from a wagon under Mr. Frost's shed, a drab-colored over-coat, lined with flannel, sleeves lined with tow cloth, large capes, velvet collar, woven kersey; also one checked horse-blanket, red and black. Any person having knowledge of the above named articles, will confer a favor on the owner, by leaving word with Mr. Frost.

ARTEMAS FLAGG.

Hinesburgh, Dec. 10, 1835.

JOB-PRINTING.

Books, Pamphlets, Blanks, Hand-bills, Way-Bills, Cards, &c. neatly executed at the

TELEGRAPH-OFFICE, BRANDON VT.